

Approved For Release 2002/10/28 : CIA-RDP80R01731R002000040007
FROM: WHAT'S LEFT OF
THE DESK OF

16 July 1975

General -

This might be of interest
to you, and you may want also to call
it to Mr. Colby's attention.

*Best regards,
Lar*

Excerpts from Statement by
W. Averell Harriman
Before the Subcommittee on Future Foreign Policy
Research and Development of the
House Committee on International Relations
Tuesday, July 15, 1975, 2:30 p.m. EDT

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

May I congratulate the initiative of the House Committee on International Relations on the appointment of this highly qualified Subcommittee to consider future United States foreign policy research and development, especially in the wake of the Vietnamese tragedy. I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, which you have afforded me to appear before this Committee.

I want first to express the hope that the Committee will not be unduly influenced by emotions engendered over Vietnam. Loyal Americans have differed deeply in our past policies in Vietnam and for widely different reasons. Scars should be permitted to heal. I have been much impressed by opinions expressed to me by foreigners whom I respect that the manner in which we recover from Vietnam is of world-wide importance.

It appears, therefore, appropriate to examine our position in the world today and to review our national interests. This

- 2 -

is such a broad undertaking that I will limit myself in this statement principally to our relations with the Soviet Union as it appears clear that Soviet relations will be for some years to come our most absorbing concern. Then, too, I have dealt with the Soviet Government for nearly 50 years both as a private business man and a public official and have known personally many of the important leaders from Trotsky on.

I don't intend to bore you with an historical recital but rather to discuss the situation today; the opportunities and the difficulties; the possible and the improbable.

In May of 1945 in San Francisco at the meeting founding the United Nations, I told a group of publishers, editors, and columnists in an off-the-record talk that we had to understand that the Kremlin's objectives and our objectives were not capable of reconciliation. The Kremlin wanted a world of communist governments -- dictatorships of the proletariat -- whereas we believed that man's interests and our own could best be served by governments responsive to the will of the people. However, I stated that we should do all in our power to settle our differences in situations around the world in order to avoid war on this small planet.

In ~~other~~ words, I believed then in "detente," the relaxation of tensions, wherever possible and still do. Unfortunately

- 3 -

today, many people seem to give that French word a much too broad meaning, confusing it with another French word, "rapprochement." It is high time to say what we mean in plain English.

In the intervening years, although the situation has changed materially within the Soviet Union, I have maintained much the same views. It is interesting that at times I have been called a warmonger and at others, soft on communism.

I have continued to believe that there would be changes within the Soviet Union brought about largely by internal pressures from the demands of the 250,000,000 Soviet peoples of different races and backgrounds. The government, in my opinion, would be forced to relax its rigid controls and to give greater respect to human rights. Changes have taken place unhappily unevenly and far too slowly. In addition to internal pressures, statements and outraged reactions from abroad by concerned groups do have an influence as the Soviet Government pays some attention at least to world opinion. On the other hand, the influence of our government and other governments can usually be most effective if exercised privately and not by attempting to link publicly ideological with practical considerations in our negotiations. There is, of course, natural linkage between some types of trade and arms control.

- 4 -

I have visited Russia twice in the last 15 months. Last year I went as a private citizen but I did have the opportunity for a three hour talk with General Secretary Brezhnev as well as meetings with other Soviet officials and journalists.

This year, Mr. Chairman, you will recall President Ford appointed me to head a delegation to attend the ceremonies in Moscow commemorating the thirty years since VE Day.

The emphasis in these ceremonies was on the thirty years of peace that the tragic wartime sacrifices had brought. In the Red Square, a youth demonstration was held -- no victory parade of soldiers. At the ceremonies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses General Secretary Brezhnev's keynote address underlined peace as the primary objective. In his hour-long speech he, of course, paid tribute to the heroism of the Red Army and the long-suffering loyal support of the people. He also recognized the assistance of the United States and Britain in the War.

The speech was addressed largely to the Russian people. It emphasized the solidarity of the Socialist Bloc for peace and was critical at times of capitalist imperialism. Yet he expressed confidence that their call for "peaceful coexistence" was being "met with serious response in many capitalist countries." Referring to our own wartime collaboration, he spoke of our present negotiations for "cooperation in order to prevent another world disaster."

- 5 -

For this hearing today I would like to quote specifically from two paragraphs. In one, after referring to "the struggle for ending the arms race," he stated: " Meanwhile, this stock-piling of weapons, including mass destruction weapons, is becoming evermore absurd. The starting of a nuclear missile war would spell inevitable annihilation for the aggressor himself --"

In the other paragraph I want to call to your attention, he stated: "The high-principled and constant Leninism support of the liberation movement of the peoples -- and the working class movement in all countries, invest our peace policy with even greater strength, influence, and popularity all over the world."

I am prompted to call these two paragraphs to your attention, Mr. Chairman, as they should be carefully considered in connection with our own policies. I believe, on the one hand, we are spending too much money on our new nuclear weapons systems, perhaps giving too little attention to our conventional military strength. On the other hand, we are neglecting the need to face Soviet support for so-called liberation movements.

The functions of the CIA are now under critical review. All abuses at home and abroad must be protected against in the future. However, the continued activity of this agency is of real importance to our security both in its intelligence activities and in its ability to help friendly peoples counter subversive activities against them.

---6---

I urge, Mr. Chairman, that this Subcommittee give appropriate consideration to these vital aspects of our foreign policy and national security.